



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,548	10/10/2003	Bradley J. Pedersen	2006579-0430 (CTX-083)	2626
69665	7590	05/30/2008	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			JEAN, FRANTZ B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2154		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/683,548	PEDERSEN, BRADLEY J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frantz B. Jean	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/15/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

This office action is in response to applicants' response filed on 4/16/08. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16, 22-24, 29-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eaton et al. ("Eaton") US 2003/0101343 in view of Knouse et al. hereinafter "Knouse" US publication Number 2003/0074580 and Wall et al. publication number WO 02/37267 A2.

As per claim 1, Eaton teaches a method for providing remote access to a plurality of application sessions (see abstract, fig 3, paragraph 0026), the method comprising: receiving authentication information associated with a user ... (fig 2, 13, paragraphs

0027- 0028, 0094-0095); authenticating the user (fig 2, 13, paragraphs 0027-0028, 0094-0095); identifying a plurality of disconnected application sessions (par 0098, 0109 and 0113) already associated with the user in response to the received information (paragraphs 0028 and 0031). Eaton fails to teach identifying from a rule source a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and determining via the rule that the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions. However, Knouse is directed to an access system interface that comprises identifying from a rule source (policy) a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and determining via the rule that the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions (see Knouse fig 15-16; paragraphs 0139, 0157, 0165, 0237, 0314, 0339, 0103 and 0104). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Knouse's features to Eaton's to securely provide access to content to users that businesses and organizations deem authorized (Knouse par 0008). One skill artisan at the time of the invention would be motivated to do so to effectively secure and manage all Various network-based interactions (see Knouse par 0009). Furthermore, Eaton and Knouse fails teach reestablishing first disconnected application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions in response to the determined rule.

Wall discloses the cited feature and other features of the claims (see Wall pages 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Wall's system to Eaton and Knouse to secure their system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to do so to securely manage and protect user's data in the system.

As per claim 2, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 wherein the first application sessions of the plurality of disconnected application sessions is running on a first server and a second application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions is running on a second server (see Eaton paragraphs 0071,0074).

As per claim 3, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 that further determining via the rule the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to the first application session based on a state of one of the first application session or the identified plurality of disconnected application session (see Knouse fig 15-16; paragraphs 0139, 0157, 0165, 0237, 0314, 0339, 0103 and 0104).

As per claims 4-5, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches automatically establishing connection to the first application session upon authentication of the received information, and wherein the rule is created by one of the user or an administrator (Eaton, paragraphs 0071,0094-0095; 0026 and 0074; knouse par 0102 and 0139).

As per claim 6, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 wherein the connection between the user and at least the first application session o the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions is triggered by the selection of a single user interface element (Eaton, paragraphs 0039, 0056, and 0097-0098).

As per claim 7, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 further comprising: determining the first application session is active and automatically connecting the client

computer operated by the user to the active first (see Eaton, par 0032, 0036, and 0113; see Knouse, par 0034 and 0084).

As per claim 8, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches the method of claim 7 further comprising determining via the rule the user is allowed to connect to application sessions for a specific application and identifying the first application session as including the specific application (Knouse, par 0095 and 0139).

As per claim 9, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches method of claim 8 further comprising determining via the rule the user is allowed to connect to application session contingent on the client computer (accessing attributes of user profile for compliance purpose, Knouse par 0099) and identifying the client computer operated by the user as allowed to connect to the first application session (see Knouse par 0099).

As per claim 10, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 further comprising authenticating the user in response to the received authentication information (Eaton, fig 2,13, paragraphs 0027-0028, 0094-0095).

As per claim 11, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 wherein the step of identifying the plurality of application sessions comprises consulting stored data associated with a plurality of servers executing application sessions (Eaton, par 0028 and 0031).

As per claim 12, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches wherein the plurality of application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to connection and, after connection, at least the first application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions is reconnected to the first client computer (Eaton, 0026, 0094, 0095).

As per claim 13, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 wherein the plurality of application sessions was associated with a first client computer prior to establishing the connection and, after establishing the connection, at least the first application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions is connected to a second client computer (Eaton, 0071, 0094, 0095).

As per claim 14, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the plurality of application sessions is one of disconnected or active (see Eaton, fig 15, par 0032, 0051-0052; see Knouse, par 0034 and 0084).

As per claim 15, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches method of claim 1 further comprising determining via the rule to connect the user to the first application session after receiving user approval (see Knouse, par 0139, 0264).

As per claim 16, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a method of claim 1 comprising automatically identifying the plurality of applications sessions upon receipt of the authentication information (Eaton, 0028, 0031,0094, 0095).

As per claims 22 and 24, Eaton fails to disclose requiring and forbidding the user to connect to the application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions based on rule from a rule source. Knouse discloses this feature (see Knouse

fig 15-16; paragraphs 0139, 0157, 0165, 0237, 0314, 0339). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Knouse's features to Eaton's to securely provide access to content to users that businesses and organizations deem authorized (Knouse par 0008). One skill artisan at the time of the invention would be motivated to do so to effectively secure and manage all various network-based interactions (see Knouse par 0009).

As per claim 23, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches rule created by one of a user or administrator (Eaton, paragraphs 0071,0094-0095; 0026; Knouse, par 0102 and 0139)

As per claim 29, Eaton teaches a server for providing remote access to an application session (see abstract, and paragraph 0026), the server comprising: a network module for receiving authentication information associated with a user operating a client computer (fig 2, 13, paragraphs 0027-0028, 0094-0095); and authentication module for authenticating the user via the authentication information received from the user (Eaton par 0028 and 0094-0095) a data store (element 58) for enumerating a plurality of application sessions associated with the user (0074); a server process for connecting the client computer operated by the user to a first application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions (0098, 0109, 0113) enumerated in the data store in response to authentication of the received information and in accordance with the one or more rules (0074). Eaton fails to a rule source for providing one or more rules governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and determining via the rule that the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of

disconnected application sessions. However, Knouse is directed to an access system interface that comprises a rule source (policy) providing rules governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and determining via the rule that the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions (see Knouse fig 15-16; paragraphs 0139, 0157, 0165, 0237, 0314, 0339, 0103 and 0104). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Knouse's features to Eaton's to securely provide access to content to users that businesses and organizations deem authorized (Knouse par 0008). One skill artisan at the time of the invention would be motivated to do so to effectively secure and manage all various network-based interactions (see Knouse par 0009).

Furthermore, Eaton and Knouse fails teach reestablishing first disconnected application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions in response to the determined rule.

Wall discloses the cited feature and other features of the claims (see Wall pages 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Wall's system to Eaton and Knouse to secure their system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to do so to securely manage and protect user's data in the system.

As per claims 30-37, they have already been discussed in rejecting claims 1-16 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 38, Eaton-Knouse teach a server of claim 29 further comprising an authentication module for authenticating the user in response to the received authentication information (Eaton, fig 2, 13, paragraphs 0027-0028, 0094-0095).

As per claim 39, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a server of claim 29 wherein the data store comprises stored data associated with a plurality of servers executing application sessions (Eaton, elements 56, 58, 104).

As per claim 40, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teach a server of claim 29 wherein the plurality of application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to connection and, after connection, at least the first application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions is reconnected to the first client computer (all these features are part of Eaton session connection; see 0026, 0071,0094-0095).

As per claim 41, Eaton-Knouse-wall teaches a server of claim 29 wherein the plurality of application sessions was associated with a first client computer prior to connection and, after connection, at least the first application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions is connected to a second client computer (all these features are part of Eaton session connection; see 0026, 0071,0094-0095).

As per claim 42, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a server of claim 29 wherein at least one of the plurality of application sessions is one of disconnected or active (Eaton, fig 15, 0098-0099,0032,0051-0052).

As per claim 43, Eaton-Knouse-Wall teaches a server of claim 29 wherein the server process determines via the one or more rules to connect to the first application session after receiving user approval at least one of the plurality of application sessions is active ((see Knouse, par 0139, 0264)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21 (2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 17-21 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eaton et al. hereinafter Eaton US publication number 2003/0101343 A1. As per claim 17, Eaton teaches a method for providing remote access to a plurality of application sessions (abstract, 0026), the method comprising: transmitting authentication information associated with a user operating one of a first computer or a second computer (fig 2, 13, paragraphs 0027-0028, 0094-0095); receiving a user

prompt indicating whether to connect to a first disconnected application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application session associated with the user during operation of the first computer (par 0026, 0071 and 0098) and receiving application output from the first application session in response to transmission of the user's indication to connect to the first application session (see paragraphs 0071 and 0098).

As per claim 18, Eaton teaches method of claim 17 wherein the receiving application output is automatic upon the transmission of the user's indication (fig 2, 13, paragraphs 0026-0028, 0071,0094 and 0098).

As per claims 19-20, Eaton teaches a method of claim 17 further comprising: receiving a user prompt to indicate whether the first application session should be terminated and remain disconnected (see par 0010, 0032, 0051-0052).

As per claim 21, Eaton teaches a method of claim 17 wherein the plurality of active application sessions is initially connected to a first client computer and, upon transmitting the information, the user is operating a second client computer (0032, 0051-0052).

As per claim 25, Eaton teaches a method of claim 17 further comprising selecting by the user a single user interface element to automatically connect to the plurality of disconnected application sessions associated with the user (Eaton, paragraphs 0039, 0056, and 0097-0098).

As per claim 26, Eaton teaches a method of claim 17 further comprising automatically transmitting the authentication of the user from one of the first computer or the second computer operated by the user (see Eaton par 0028 and 0094-0095).

As per claim 27, Eaton teaches a method of claim 17 wherein the plurality of disconnected application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to disconnection and, at connection, at least the first application session of the plurality of disconnected application session is reconnected to the first client computer (0098-0099).

As per claim 28, Eaton teaches a method of claim 17 wherein the plurality of disconnected application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to disconnection and, at connection, at least the first application session of the plurality of disconnected application session is connected to a second client computer (0098, 0099).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz B. Jean whose telephone number is 571-272-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 M-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Frantz B. Jean/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154